

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20513

Ordinarily if a President and a Congress are of the same political faith, the President can have his program and his policies enacted into law. But this is not always true and the present Congress with its overwhelming Democratic majority proves it.

In this country, neither major political party is forced to go along with the program of the chief executive. Both parties are made up of individuals of widely divergent views, particularly the Democrats with their northern liberals and their southern conservatives.

The Republicans although basically more conservative nevertheless have a strong liberal faction, made up principally of Congressmen and Senators from the eastern seaboard.

Members of Congress, especially those in the House of Representatives who must run for reelection every 2 years, are understandably closer to the people than is the President.

And they rise and fall on the basis of how well they reflect the view of their constituents when they get to Washington.

Therefore, it isn't wise for voters to overlook their choice of a Congressman in the excitement and ballyhoo of a presidential campaign.

Selection of a national leader to speak for all the people is, of course, a matter of great importance, but so is the choice of the individual who has a vote in the most powerful governmental unit in the world, the U.S. Congress.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, that very distinguished political analyst of the Washington Post, Chalmers Roberts, in his column today made a serious error in his statement:

Some of her colleagues report that she is no friend personally or ideologically of Goldwater though there has been talk of her running on a Goldwater ticket.

Mr. Roberts is in serious error. I consider BARRY GOLDWATER to be a good personal friend of mine—and I certainly consider myself to be a friend of his.

What constitutes friendship on an ideological basis is a real puzzler. I am sure that people can have ideological differences and still be friends—just as I am sure that sharing the same ideologies does not necessarily make persons friends.

But I am not one to begrudge Mr. Roberts his literary license if it will create a little more appeal in his writing—any more than his column of September 23, 1963, in which he indicted me in advance with the speculation that should I vote against the test ban treaty it would be an attempt to curry political favor with Senator GOLDWATER. Strangely enough, he has never commented on my vote against the Goldwater reservation to the test ban treaty.

Mr. Roberts could have avoided the serious errors of his columns of September 23, 1963, and November 12, 1963, had he taken the time to check with me rather than speculate or attribute to anonymous sources.

It is a very serious matter to charge enmity between two persons when that enmity does not exist. Lest this misrepresentation give further erroneous impressions, let me state very clearly that I consider myself to be a personal friend of BARRY GOLDWATER.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as we observe American Education Week, it is appropriate to call attention to the fundamental relationship between a democratic form of government and public education. As Woodrow Wilson put it so well, "Without popular education, no government which rests upon popular action can long endure." Certainly a comprehensive system of education is essential to our democratic system if we are to provide equality of opportunity, preserve our cultural heritage, and meet the challenges of international competition.

Because I am convinced of the importance of a sound educational system to national survival and progress, I am particularly proud of the leading role which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has held in the development of public education in this country. It was in 1642 that the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony made it mandatory that all children in the colony receive some education. Five years later the "Old Deluder Satan Act" established the principle of publicly supported elementary and secondary schools by requiring every town of 50 households to hire a teacher and every town of 100 households to establish a grammar school. Again, in 1827, Massachusetts led the Nation when it passed the first State law encouraging the spread of the public high school. In the 7 years that followed, the public school movement was given further impetus by the enactment of laws which made support of public schools by taxation compulsory, abolished fees as a requisite for attendance at school, and declared them open without charge. In 1837 Massachusetts established the first State school board with Horace Mann, the father of the American public school, as its secretary and in 1852 the Commonwealth enacted the first compulsory school attendance law. Indeed, in the field of education Massachusetts has an impressive record of firsts. All citizens of the Bay State are proud that it has done so much to promote the establishment of free and universal education in the United States because we recognize the connection between educational opportunity and the social, political, and economic advancement of a free society.

We do not have a democratic system unless our people have the opportunity to develop fully their talents and intelligence. We live in difficult times and it is important to our progress and our future that every person be encouraged to develop maximum use of his abilities. This development is a fundamental purpose of education. Education also faces the critical challenge of preparing the next generation for its responsibilities. As James Bryant Conant, the former president of Harvard University has written:

The primary concern of American education today is to cultivate in the largest number of our citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free.

In a speech Dr. Conant made another important point:

As events in Europe within our lifetime have all too clearly demonstrated, the greatest single need of a free society is a widespread determination among the citizens to defend the basic principles of that society against external and internal foes. A spirit of freedom coupled with an understanding of the nature of our governmental machinery and an interest in improving this machinery is essential for the continuation of a government based on the consent of the governed.

We must also be aware of the practical reasons for a comprehensive system of public education. Among teenagers who are no longer in school the unemployment rate is 27 percent. We should remember the warning of Dr. Conant that the young, uneducated, untrained, and culturally deprived adult is "social dynamite." In addition, between now and 1975 the number of young people seeking higher education will double. We want our educational system to be prepared for them.

Thus, as we observe American Education Week, let us remember that a comprehensive system of education is essential to our democracy. Through education we must provide opportunity for individual development, we must assure the preservation of the foundations of our Government, and we must make maximum use of the abilities of our citizens. As the future of our education is dependent upon us, so our future is dependent upon education.

In calling attention in education week to the importance of our educational system we should not fail to mention the dedicated work of the schoolteachers of America to whom we entrust our children. Because of their activities our children will become more independent and self-reliant and better citizens in the days to come.

To meet its responsibility to society today, education must trigger the curiosity of students and awaken in them a desire to understand their Government and the world about them. It must help them to gain that understanding and it must stimulate and prepare them to assume an active role in community and Government activities. If it is doing its job, it will alert them to the drama, the excitement, and the satisfactions of that experience. This is an important responsibility, and one which I am confident the Nation's teachers are attempting to meet.

OTEPKA TESTIMONY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star there was published an editorial entitled "Otepka Testimony."

This editorial calls our attention to a situation in which high ranking State Department employees first gave false testimony to a congressional committee; then, when caught, they reversed this testimony and admitted the truth.

But the truth is even more shocking. Officials of the Government admit that they illegally tapped Mr. Otepka's telephone. Tapping a telephone under such circumstances is a violation of the law, and smacks of police state tactics.

I suggest that the State Department promptly fire those responsible, and that

the Attorney General of the United States bring prompt action against this illegal invasion of a man's privacy for no reason other than political reprisal.

In this instance all that Mr. Otepka was guilty of was cooperating with a congressional committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Otepka Testimony," published in the Washington Evening Star, and an article entitled "Aids Admit Wiretap Use on Otepka," may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Nov. 11, 1963]

OTEPKA TESTIMONY

It is perfectly clear that State Department employees, including one with the rank of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, did not tell the whole truth in sworn testimony given a Senate subcommittee in the Otepka case.

This should be a matter of grave concern to the Secretary of State. Two of the three men involved have been put on an indefinite leave status, with pay. It is disturbing, however, that there has been no forthright official condemnation of their testimony before the subcommittee.

Otto F. Otepka has been dismissed by the State Department for giving certain information, allegedly improperly, to J. G. Sourwine, counsel to the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee. The case against Mr. Otepka was based on material found by searching his "burn bag"—a receptacle for discarded papers which are supposed to be burned. At that time instructions were given by Department officials which were construed as forbidding other State employees to give any information to the subcommittee. These instructions have been lifted.

The question now is not whether Mr. Otepka was properly dismissed. He has taken an appeal from his dismissal and the merits will be determined in that proceeding. Nor is the real question concerned with the right to search burn bags or—even—to tap telephones. The question is simply whether witnesses from the State Department must tell the whole truth when they testify before a committee of Congress.

In this case it is clear that an attempt was made to tap Mr. Otepka's telephone. It is equally clear that an attempt was made to deceive or mislead the subcommittee on this point. Secretary Dean Rusk ought to move in fast to lower the boom on this sort of thing.

AIDS ADMIT WIRETAP ON OTEPKA

WASHINGTON.—Three State Department officials now have acknowledged to Senate investigators telephone wiring in Otto F. Otepka's office was rigged to permit eavesdropping on conversations in his office.

However, they said no actual interception of conversations took place, none was authorized, and the wiring was disconnected within 48 hours after a test of its feasibility proved unsuccessful.

The officials said their statements were intended to amplify and clarify earlier sworn testimony to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in which they denied knowledge of the installation of any listening devices in Otepka's office.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, made public the statements and the earlier testimony without comment.

Otepka, a veteran State Department security officer, was notified Tuesday of his dismissal on charges of unbecoming conduct. Among other things, he was accused of sup-

plying the subcommittee with information from confidential employee loyalty files.

Senator THOMAS J. DONN, Democrat, of Connecticut, the subcommittee's vice chairman, in a Senate speech Tuesday protested Otepka's dismissal as an affront to the Senate. He said then that the State Department had installed a tap on the security officer's telephone.

"Although a State Department official has denied under oath that this was done, the Subcommittee on Internal Security has proof that the tap was installed," Donn added.

Statements acknowledging the rigging of Otepka's telephone were sent to EASTLAND to John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security; David I. Bellale, special assistant to Reilly, and Elmer Dewey Hill, Chief of the Division of Technical Services in the Department's Office of Security.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly on the pending amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield, so that I may ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to insure that the Senate be given the opportunity to review any agreement reached between the U.S. Government and the Government of Czechoslovakia with regard to U.S. claims before such an agreement comes into effect. The claims involved are claims for property, rights or interests therein owned by U.S. citizens taken or nationalized on or prior to January 1, 1945, by the Government of Czechoslovakia.

These claims, let me make clear, are not for war damages or injury of that type; they are compensation for deliberate seizure by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia for which no recompense has yet been offered. They are claims that have been adjudicated and awarded by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. There are altogether a total of 2,630 cases, amounting to \$113,645,205.41 in principal and interest. Some 1,346 claims were rejected by the Commission. Those it awarded represent definite, adjudicated instances in which property of U.S. nationals was seized.

Yet it is my understanding that the Department of State is presently considering an agreement to settle with the Czechoslovak Government for approximately \$11 million or less than 10 cents on each dollar.

Mr. President, for the more than 2,600 persons and firms involved, such an agreement would be meaningless and would in fact amount to U.S. acceptance of nationalization without anything approaching fair compensation.

Furthermore, a settlement of the Czech claims for roughly 10 percent

would constitute a very dangerous precedent. The United States has, since World War II, negotiated claims conventions with six nations. The first, with Italy, in 1947, was for 100 percent of the value of U.S. claims. The second, with Yugoslavia in 1948, was for 91 percent of the value of U.S. claims. The third, in 1950 with Panama, was for 90 percent. The fourth, in 1960 with Rumania, was for 24 percent. The fifth with Poland was for claims not yet completely processed. And the most recent, with Bulgaria, was for 40 percent. It is ironic that the two free world countries paid 100 and 90 percent of claims against them, while the Communist nations are succeeding in paying a far smaller share.

It is particularly disturbing that the number of awards on the Czech claims, 2,630, is larger than that of any other country. The two other nations with claims administered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission that have not yet been agreed upon through conventions, are also very large: Hungary with 1,153 adjudicated claims and the Soviet Union with 1,925 adjudicated claims.

In other words, if an agreement of roughly 10 percent is concluded with Czechoslovakia, we can expect no better terms from Hungary or the U.S.S.R. and a total value of close to \$300 million of validated U.S. claims may be simply junked.

Therefore, Mr. President, not only in the interest of the Czechoslovakia claimants, but of others for the future, I believe it is time for the Senate to look into this area and request the opportunity to offer its advice and consent to the Czechoslovakian and perhaps any succeeding claims convention that is less than 50 percent of the value of adjudicated claims. Although recent claims settlements have been called executive agreements and therefore not submitted to the Senate, there is a precedent for this action in the Panamanian settlement which was ratified by the Senate August 9, 1950. As that settlement amounted to 90 percent, it strikes me as a good precedent to follow.

Even more important, however, in my judgment, a settlement of less than 10 percent of the awarded claims is not by any stretch of the imagination mere execution of a policy laid down by the Congress. Rather, it is a deliberate and calculating act of policy. The cases of the Communist claims appear to reflect a considered effort to smooth U.S. diplomatic relations with Communist bloc nations at the expense of individual U.S. claimants. Perhaps such a move is in the national interest; perhaps it is justified; perhaps the Senate would give its advice and consent to such an agreement if the pros and cons were carefully weighed.

But in any case, U.S. agreement on only 10 percent compensation is surely not what the Congress intended in setting up the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to determine the "fair or proved value of the said property, right or interest," often after years of hearings. Therefore, I strongly believe that the Senate should request, formally by re-